II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this Amendment, claims 1-9, 15 and 16 remain pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 05-075127 issued to Yoshiyuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,821,575 to Mistry et al. (Mistry).

Claim 1 recites

> an integrated field-effect transistor, having a substrate region surrounded:
> by two terminal regions, one terminal region being a source region and the other terminal region being a drain region, the source region being arranged at a first side of the substrate region and the drain region being arranged at a second side of the substrate region, the first and second sides being opposite sides of the substrate region;
> by two electrically insulating insulating layers, which are arranged at a third and fourth side of the substrate region, the third and fourth sides being mutually opposite sides of the substrate region and the insulating layers being adjoined by control regions, the control regions being located along the third and fourth sides with an insulating layer of the insulating layers between each of the control regions and the substrate region, the first and second sides being narrower than the third and fourth sides;
> by two electrically insulating regions, the insulating regions being arranged at mutually opposite sides of the substrate region, a first insulating region of the insulating regions being arranged at a fifth side of the substrate region and a second insulating region of the insulating regions being arranged at a sixth side of the substrate region, and
> by an electrically conductive connecting region or a part of an electrically conductive connecting region which produces an electrically conductive connection between one of the terminal regions and the substrate region, the connecting region comprising a metal-semiconductor compound ...

Yoshiyuki is an altogether different structure than provided in claim 1 and does not show a substrate region surrounded by the other components on each of the six sides as claimed. As identified by the examiner, the gate in Yoshiyuki is identified at 3-1. The other components in Yoshiyuki are formed around the gate 3-1 not a substrate region. The corresponding substrate region has not even fully been identified by the examiner (page 3, line 13 the substrate region is only identified as "3" which does not refer to any particular element in the drawings or specification). There is only a single gate or control region 3-1 and it is *not* located on two opposite sides of a substrate region. The drain and source are located on opposite sides of the gate 3-1 not a substrate region. In general, Yoshiyuki clearly does not teach the basic relationship defined in claim 1 between the substrate region and each of the other elements being as on specified opposite sides of the substrate region.

Further, claim 1 also recites that the connecting region also covering a covered area of the source region such that the connecting region extends across the first side of the substrate region to the source region, the part of the covered area of the substrate region being located between the insulating layers and between the control regions. Yoshiyuki also clearly does not teach these elements. The examiner contends that the connecting region corresponds to 3-7. However, 3-7 is not located between the insulating layers and between the control regions. Further, it is not at all clear how 3-7 covers a covered area of the source region such that the connecting region extends across the first side of the substrate region to the source region.

As such, the combination of Yoshiyuki and Mistry does not teach each of the elements provided in claim 1.

Claims 2, 4-7 and 15-16 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiyuki and Mistry, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,683,918 to Smith et al. (Smith).

Claims 3 and 8 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiyuki and Mistry, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003,0178670 to Fried et al. (Fried).

Claims 9 depends from claim 1 and is, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdraw of the rejections and allowance of the present claims.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: November 19, 2010

/Robert K. Fergan/
Robert K. Fergan
Reg. No.: 51,674
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000